

C A L L I O P E

A
JOURNAL OF
INQUIRY, ANALYSIS, AND ELOQUENCE

QUEEN'S COLLEGE
SPRING, 1984

Managing Editors

Dr. Richard T. Goode

Ms. Susan Luck Hooks

Dr. Robert W. Whalen

Board Of Editors

Dr. Carol Boggs, Social Sciences

Dr. Diane Castle, Humanities

Dr. William Davis, Fine Arts

Dr. Robert Finley, Business

Dr. Rebecca C. Jann, Natural Sciences

Ms. Suzanne E. Tatro, Nursing

* ADVERTISEMENT *

Gentle Reader,

"Let us dare to read, to think, speak, and write," John Adams urged his fellow citizens in 1770; the editors and authors of Calliope have answered Adams's challenge. The essays that follow were written by undergraduates of Queens College. They were submitted by instructors and selected by the editors of Calliope for publication because they represent the diversity, as well as the principles, of Queens College, for Queens College and Calliope share the conviction that honest inquiry, reasoned argument, and eloquent expression are things to be honored.

Calliope was the Greek muse of eloquence, and we hope that she will be pleased by these essays. A "calliope" is also, a steam-driven instrument that, after a great sweating and huffing, produces a pleasing melody -- a metaphorical essayist, in other words.

The articles that follow are quite literally "essays"-- "attempts," "trys," by our students to understand complicated problems and express complex thoughts. Even teachers are ultimately students, and as fellow students, we are happy to honor the authors of these essays by presenting their work to the public.

We would like to thank the faculty members of Queens College who served as Calliope's board of editors. Thanks are also due to Dr. Richard Ault, who taught us how to print Calliope, and to Wendy Ingram, who assisted in the preparation of the manuscript. Finally, we would like to thank Dr. Cynthia Tyson, Dr. Clyda Rent, and Dr. William A. Thompson for their support of this project.

Richard Goode

Susan Luck Hooks

Robert Weldon Whalen

The Diversity of Romanticism

by

Kathryn Lyons

The period of Romanticism was one characterized by a wide variety of reactions to the extreme rationalism of neo-classicism and the Enlightenment. Although these responses were not easily classified, they did hold in common a belief in the individual and his personal feelings, in the value of the uncorrupted state of nature, and in the essential connection between humanity and nature for discovering truth. Despite these underlying threads of unity, the manners in which individuals expressed their beliefs could differ widely. Wordsworth, in "The Green Linnet," and Turner, in "The Slave Ship," present individual views of Romanticism through their overall purposes for creating their works, their involvement of the reader or viewer in the feeling of their works, and their presentation of Man in his relationship to nature.

Turner, in painting "The Slave Ship", seemed to have two purposes in mind, both of which were Romantic. The subject of slaves stricken by disease, dumped overboard with chains still on their wrists, makes a powerful Romantic comment on a political and social situation that allowed injustice to continue against individuals. Turner, like most Romantics, was for the individual and against any organized state, authority, or institution that tried to suppress him. However, Turner seemed to have another purpose, for the focus is on the forces of nature in the picture, and not on the hazy suggestiveness of the slaves in the water. Perhaps he was asserting that just as suppressing individuals and tolerating injustice can destroy our lives, nature too, and even more so, has the potential to overcome and destroy us through a natural phenomenon like the approaching typhoon in the painting.

Like Turner, Wordsworth had a specific purpose in mind when writing "The Green Linnet." Although still very Romantic, his purpose differed from Turner's, for he felt that "The poet writes under one restriction only...giving immediate pleasure to a human being." This Romantic idea that the poet can create pleasure for others through his poetic imagination is evident in Wordsworth's conveying happiness and exuberant feelings about a particular natural experience, not through a statement of personal feelings, but through his description of the bird's activities. By

CALLIOPE

The Diversity of Romanticism

presenting the bird as "scattering thy goodness without care," "thyself thy own enjoyment," and "perched in ecstasies," Wordsworth shares a feeling of pleasure and delight.

In his attempt to create a pleasurable experience for the reader, Wordsworth even takes the pains to avoid harsh language that would be inappropriate in describing the pleasure. He achieves this through the consistent use of the "s" sound in the first stanza. Wordsworth's overall purpose in evoking a pleasurable response from the reader is typically Romantic, especially since he achieves this response through the reader's identification with his own feelings.

Turner, in "The Slave Ship," also heavily involves the viewer in the emotion of the painting without actually explaining his feelings, for like most Romantic artists, he placed great importance on sharing personal feelings with others. Through the use of pathetic fallacy, the viewer is swept into the whirlwind of motion and into the openness and incompleteness of the work to experience the overpowering sense of helplessness that nature forces on a person. This Romantic notion of the constant activity and incompleteness in nature is achieved through the use of undefined boundaries of color and light that do not restrict the movement of the typhoon in the painting. This freely applied color and light contributes to the overall sensual experience. Turner creates for the viewer, which is achieved through contrasts of light, dark, and shocking hot colors, such as in the rich color of the sun against the clouds, the brightness of the direct sunlight, and the contrasting light and dark waves. Turner further enhances the experience by rejecting artificiality and stylization and by giving texture to the painting with visible brush strokes, which allow the viewer to respond and identify with the subject more fully.

In "The Green Linnet," the reader can excitedly participate in the constant movement of the bird through Wordsworth's elaborate description in such phrases as "brother of the dancing leaves," "flits," and "seeming still to hover." The bird, being a part of nature, is in a constant state of flux like nature. Furthermore, the uninterrupted flow of the first three lines of each half of the stanzas, followed by a fourth line that screeches to a halt, might well be Wordsworth's attempt to show the constant fluttering of the bird followed by his temporary perching upon a branch. Although the stanzas are structured, they do not restrict the flow of thought from one line to the next, which is illustrative of the Romantic notion of rejecting artificial stylization. Like Turner, Wordsworth bombards the reader with a sensual experience that forces him to involve himself in the emotion of the moment. Visually, phrases such as

CALLIOPE
The Diversity of Romanticism

"dazzled sight he oft deceives" (as if the bird's movement defies even sight), "There! Where the flutter of his wings upon his back..." and "Brightest sunshine around me spread," force the viewer to picture the scene in his mind. Wordsworth even uses the "s" sound to make the phrase "pours forth his song in gushes" actually sound like the bird's song. By being forced to understand the scene through the senses, the reader is actually plunged into experiencing the feelings Wordsworth himself felt.

Perhaps the most powerful statements of Romanticism in these two works are in their unique views of nature. The turbulence of the typhoon in Turner's work seems to overcome the viewer with its power, evoking feelings of terror at nature's "aweful"ness. The idea of the sublime quality of irrational, uncontrollable nature as a positive creative force is typically Romantic. Turner paints the natural elements, such as the ominous clouds, the choppy waves, the approaching typhoon, and the streaming sunlight, in a swirling, fluid manner so that the viewer cannot separate the different parts, which reinforces the idea of unity of nature. Turner's "use of light, color, and movement to represent a cosmic union of the elements in which earth, sky, fire, and water dissolve into one another and every trace of the material world disappears..." makes a powerful Romantic statement about the creative force of within this constantly moving, chaotic state of nature. Romantics believed that order and truth could be found. They attributed the creative potential of Man from nature's power to the God who created it, for, as Coleridge (and many Romantics) believed, "the primary imagination...(is) a repetition in the finite mind of the infinite I AM."

The view of nature Wordsworth presents in "The Green Linnet" is radically different from Turner's sublime nature, yet it is no less a statement of Romanticism. Wordsworth's nature is a calm, serene nature with which man and nature can feel a oneness of organic unity. This Romantic idea of communion between man and nature is emphasized by Wordsworth's describing the relationship as a "friendship", and a private, personal meeting of man with nature in a "sequestered nook." Wordsworth, like many Romantics, felt that the powerful feelings experienced as a result of nature's inspiration were the most pure and uncorrupted feelings; therefore, man was most likely to find eternal truth from his personal experience with nature. The idea is quite different from Turner's view of finding truth from chaos in nature. Behind the nature that reveals truth, Wordsworth, like Turner, found a God who created it. As a result, nature itself was deemed worthy by the Romantics to be worshipped in and of itself. In the second stanza, Wordsworth presents the idea that nature is a reflection of God by applying such descriptive religious language as "worships him," "the blest," "Presiding Spirit," and "Thy

CALLIOPE
The Diversity of Romanticism

dominion." Nature, then, to Wordsworth, was the sole source of inspiration for creativity, and only by achieving a oneness with its forces could one discover truth.

Although "The Green Linnet" and the "The Slave Ship" seem to present two dramatically different experiences, they both reveal some of the most basic beliefs of the Romantic period. The fact that they reveal these beliefs in such varied ways attests even more strongly to the fact that Romantic thought was not just a well-defined set of rules, but instead a vast collection of diverse ideas reacting against the Enlightenment in individual, expressive ways.

As You Like It

by

Irene Zurek

Shakespeare's As You Like It is a romantic comedy that develops the motif of love as a mysterious force able to regenerate a corrupted social world form that it has been banished. The reader is presented with two contrasting worlds: a jaded court of corruption and vice, and an idyllic forest of love and imagination. These two worlds act together to contribute to the WORLD of the play.

The court of As You Like It is an "infected world" of "painted pomp" where hatred and envy abound. The social order of this courtly world has been marred by the widespread corruption that has fostered suspicion and discontent among the citizens of the court. Rosalind, whose father has been banished by Duke Frederick and who herself is about to be banished, tells Celia, "O, how full of briers is this working-day world!" (II,iii,12). Orlando, too, is a victim of oppression in the court. Having been denied his birthright of education by his brother Oliver, who subsequently plots against his life, Orlando flees to the Forest of Arden as a refuge against further social injustice. The court is a world of mistrust based upon guilt by association. Duke Frederick condemns both Orlando and Rosalind on the basis of their parentage, telling Orlando, "I would thou hadst been been son to some man else" (I,ii,214), and explaining Rosalind's exile to her by declaring, "Thou art thy father's daughter, there's enough" (I,iii,56). The court is a place permeated by arrogance and extravagance, where "courtier's hands are perfumed with civet" (III,ii,61).

The enchanted Forest of Arden is a "golden world" of imaginative escape where there is "good in everything" (II,i,17). Here time is loose, expansive, never in short supply. Orlando tells Rosalind, "There's no clock in the forest" (III,ii,297) and describes the inhabitants of the forest as ones who "under the shade of melancholy bough lose and neglect the creeping hours of time" (II, vii,110). The residents of the forest live their lives flowing along in fanciful idleness, with no duty or toil to regulate their lives. This unlimited freedom provides some compensation for the many conveniences of life that the forest lacks.

CALLIOPE
As You Like It

Things are relative, however, and deep down human nature is the same at the court as it is in the country. As Corin explains to Touchstone, "Those that are good manners at the court are as ridiculous in the country as the behavior of the country is most mockable at the court" (III,ii,43-45). Neither world is better than the other--just different. As Portia expounds in *The Merchant Of Venice*, "How many things by season season'd are To their right praise and true perfection!" (V,i,107-108). Touchstone, beginning to miss his home in the court, desires the best of both worlds. In speaking about the shepherd's life, he says"

In respect that it is solitary, I like it very well; but in respect that it is privated, it is a very vile life...As it is a spare life, look you, it fits my humor well; but as there is no more plenty in it, it goes much against my stomach.

(III,ii,15-20)

This paradoxical speech sums up Touchstone's only too human striving for a life that can combine the peaceful solitude and simplicity of nature with the convenience and excitement of city life. Like this one, nearly all of Touchstone's speeches in the play deal with man's fleshly needs and desires and therefore serve as reminders to the other characters in the forest of their mortal nature and of the need to keep their heads out of the clouds.

In addition to Touchstone's worldly, materialistic influence, the forest itself offers some harsh reminders of the true condition of mankind. Orlando and Adam find that death through starvation in the forest is all too real a possibility. Rosalind, Celia, and Touchstone, who experience hunger and exhaustion in the forest, realize that living so close to nature isn't all it's cracked up to be. Touchstone complains, "Ay, now am I in Arden, the more fool I. When I was at home I was in a better place" (II,iv, 14-15). Even Duke Sr. becomes unhappy in his idyllic forest refuge. When he first comes to the forest, he is relieved to be away from the decadence and flattery of the court, and welcomes the cold forest winter, insisting, "Sweet are the uses of adversity" (II, i,12); he concedes, however, that surviving in the forest means the slaughter of deer; and as time goes on, his growing discontent begins to manifest itself when he tells Orlando that "we are not all alone unhappy. This wide and universal theatre presents more woeful pageants than the scene wherein we play in" (II,vii,134-137).

CALLIOPE
As You Like It

Jaques' melancholic moralizing on life and the condition of mankind also puts a damper on the carefree spirits of everyone in the forest, intimating that maybe life there isn't as idyllic as it seems. Jaques longs to be like Touchstone. Having returned from travels abroad, Jaques seems dissatisfied with the simple forest life and yearns to live the life of the court fool: "O, that I were a fool! I am ambitious for a motley coat" (II,vii,42-43). The appearance of Touchstone in the forest has revived in Jaques his commitment to a view of life as a "meaningless process of decay governed by inexorable time."1 As a literary satirist, Jaques sees it as his function in that life to awaken men's minds to their folly. He tells Duke Sr., "I must have liberty...to blow on whom I please...the wise man's folly is anatomized even by the squand'ring glances of the fool" (II,vii,47,49,56-57). Duke Sr. reacts with hostility to Jaques' melancholic sarcasm. He sees Jaques' melancholy as being the result of a licentious life that Jaques, like many travellers, has led abroad:

Most mischievous sin, in chiding sin./For thou
thyself has been a libertine,/ As sensual as the
brutish sting itself;/And all th' embossed sores and
headed evils,.../Wouldst thou disgorge into the
general world.

(II,vii,64-69)

Jaques, as usual, has a comeback, defending satire merely by saying that anyone who feels himself being personally attacked by satire merely condemns himself as possessing that folly; thus, their debate ends pretty much a draw. Following closely on the heels of this discussion comes Jaques' "Seven Ages of Man" speech, which is prompted by Orlando's threatening demand of food for Adam, who is "oppress'd with two weak evils, age and hunger" (II,vii,131). Jaques responds:

All the world's a stage,/ And all men and women
merely players./ They have their exits and
entrances,/ And one man in his time plays many
parts,/ His acts being seven ages.../ Last scene of
all,/ That ends this strange eventful history,/ Is
second childishness and mere oblivion,/ Sans teeth,
sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything.

(II,vii,138-164)

Jaques' pessimistic view of old age is refuted, however, by the appearance of old Adam, who is the personification of loving devotion and selflessness.

CALLIOPE
As You Like It

The court and the forest, however, do share a few elements in common. Both worlds contain sadness and melancholy. In the court Orlando and Rosalind despair because of their mistreatment and banishment, while Duke Frederick is distraught when he learns of his daughter's disappearance. In the Forest of Arden, all the visitors from the court miss the institutions and comforts of city life they have left behind. Duke Sr. tells Orlando, "True is it that we have seen better days,/And have with the holy bell been knoll'd to church" (I,i,vii,120-121). Both worlds also display a discrepancy between appearance and reality. The court is a place full of insincerity where courtiers use flattery to better their positions. Orlando commends Adam on his faithfulness and loyalty, characteristics that so strikingly contrast with those of the typical courtier: "Thou are not for the fashion of these times,/ Where none will sweat but for promotion,/ And having that do choke their service up/ Even with the having" (II,iii,59-62). In the forest, Rosalind disguises herself as a man to protect Celia and herself while traveling in the forest. Orlando accepts her as "one of the guys" and seeks her advice on love. Phebe, too, is deceived by Rosalind's disguise and immediately falls in love with her.

Probably the most strikingly similarity between the court and the forest is the existence of love in both. At first glance the court seems to be devoid of any love whatsoever, but a second examination reveals evidence to the contrary. To begin with, Rosalind and Celia, who grew up together in the court, have developed a love there that is "dearer than the natural bond of sisters" (I,ii,266); their's is a love in its supreme form--that of loyal and lasting friendship. In addition, despite mistreatment by his brother, Orlando still bears Oliver a brotherly love that he displays when he rescues Oliver from a lioness in the forest. Even Oliver seems to have a deep-seated love for Orlando, for he is quickly reconciled to him in the forest, tends his wounds, and acts as his ambassador to Rosalind. The love and friendship in the Forest of Arden is abundant and easily spotted. Duke Sr. addresses his followers as "my co-mates and brothers in exile" (II,i,1) and cherishes his forest life because it is "exempt from public haunt" (II,i,15). At the court Orlando, who has been wronged by his brother, feels he has no friends, and tells Rosalind at the wrestling match, "I shall do my friends no wrong, for I have none to lament me" (I,ii,181). In the forest, however, he finds friends. Old Adam, who is a servant to Oliver, displays "the constant service of the antique world" (II,iii,57) when he sacrifices his money as well as his position to accompany Orlando into the forest. Orlando returns his friendship when he aids the starving, ailing Adam, who has not fared well from the long journey, into the forest. Orlando himself is aided and befriended by Duke Sr., who returns good for

CALLIOPE
As You Like It

evil by welcoming Orlando when he comes fiercely demanding food. Likewise, the friendship of Celia and Rosalind flowers in the Forest of Arden, where together they face both hardship and happiness.

Love is, indeed, the absorbing interest of most of the characters in play, and for each it is awakened at first sight. Rosalind and Orlando fall for each other in their first encounter at the wrestling match. Celia questions Rosalind, "Is it possible, on such a sudden, you should fall into so strong a liking with old Sir Rowland's youngest son?" (I,iii,26-28), yet Celia turns right around and does the same thing, falling for the formerly wicked Oliver, and he for her, before scarcely a word has passed between them. Orlando, somewhat hypocritically, asks Oliver, "Is't possible that on so little acquaintance you should like her?" (V,ii,1). Likewise, the scornful Phebe gets her due when she falls in love with the disguised Rosalind upon their first encounter.

Once caught under love's spell, the characters carry it to extremes. Silvius' Petrarchian wooing of Phebe, even in the face of her rebukes and disdain, is enough to turn one's stomach. Orlando is transformed from a shy, tongue-tied lover into one who degrades himself by his exaggerated idealization of his absent mistress. Phebe, too, carries her infatuation overboard. Rosalind, on the other hand, like all of Shakespeare's "golden girls," is practical and wise, recognizing the danger of excess. She instructs Jaques against too much melancholy and counsels Silvius, Phebe, and Orlando against excesses in love. Rosalind's love for Orlando runs just as deep as his for her, yet she is seeking a clear-sighted relationship based upon a more solid foundation than a mere passing fancy. Rosalind has been warned that "the oath of a lover is no stronger than the word of a tapster; they are both the confirmer of false reckonings," (III,iv,29-31) and she is aware that "Most friendship is feigning, most loving mere folly" (II,vii,180). These notions are, in fact, confirmed by Silvius' accounts of the endless follies he has been driven by his passion to commit. He questions Corin, "But if thy love were ever like to mine.../How many actions most ridiculous/Has thou been drawn to by that fantasy?" and concludes, "If thou rememb'rest not the slightest folly/That ever love did make thee run into,/Thou hast not lov'd" (II,iv,28-29,32-34). Indeed, Rosalind recognizes that "love is merely a madness" (III,ii,390) and proposes to cure Orlando of it, preferring his love to be a more rational and mature one that will endure.

CALLIOPE
As You Like It

The characters do, however, learn from their folly. The two "tyrants," Oliver and Duke Frederick, both renounce their evil lives in favor of more acceptable social institutions--for Oliver, his marriage to Celia, and for Duke Frederick, commitment to a life of religious devotion in the forest. Silvius, Phebe, Celia, and Orlando learn how to love maturely and responsibly. These revelations contribute to the rejuvenation of the court to which they will return. Everyone is transported to a new world--everyone, that is, except for Touchstone and Jaques, who are both outsiders in this world of love. Their function is to stand aloof from life and comment on man's imperfections and follies. They do not share in the revitalization that everyone else experiences at the play's end. Each is destined to remain forever in his own world.

Such is the world of As You Like It. It is a world of love--both hidden and apparent; a world where passion rules but is tempered by reason; a world where love has the power to conquer all.

A Review of The Theory of Evolution
As Presented In ON THE ORIGIN OF SPECIES
by
Brenda Allen

Charles Darwin's theory of evolution, as presented in ON THE ORIGIN OF THE SPECIES, has been, perhaps, the most influential and yet controversial theory of the modern era. It has been misunderstood by fundamentalist creationists, misapplied by wealthy capitalists, and has been the source of hot debate since it was first proposed. Today, Darwin's theory of evolution is still questioned by Creationists and is beginning to be questioned by scientists who believe evolution may be better described by a process known as punctuated equilibrium rather than gradualism. One doubts that Darwin could have anticipated the magnitude of debate sparked by his theory of evolution based on natural selection-survival of the fittest. He presented his theory as logical explanation for the facts of biology, geology, etc., and he hoped that further scientific discoveries would confirm his ideas. Darwin's theory has and continues to come under fire from both scientists and non-scientists alike, and though some of the chaff has been burned away, the basic theory still commands respect and presents a valid picture of reality.

Charles Darwin formulated the theory of evolution after looking at such phenomena and the appearance of the same or very closely related species in the same and different geographic locations, the difficulty of determining what constitutes a species or a variety, the extinction and rarity of some species, and the profound embryological and morphological similarities between organisms that traditionally had not been considered related:

As many more individuals of each species are born than can possibly survive; and as, consequently, there is a frequently recurring struggle for existence, it follows that any being, if it varies however slightly in any manner profitable to itself, under the complex and sometimes varying conditions of life, will have a better chance of surviving, thus be naturally selected.(1)

Darwin also called the process of natural selection "survival of

CALLIOPE Theory of Evolution

the fittest." By this, he meant that the strongest, most well-adapted individuals would be the most apt to survive and produce fertile offspring who would inherit the advantageous qualities of their parents. The favorable variations in each individual would, through inheritance, spread throughout an entire variety or species. Eventually, new species would be formed because the variations would make the varying individuals different from the originals, perhaps in another location, who had not inherited the variations.

Darwin believed that all species, alive and extinct, arose from a few ancestral species. He said, "I believe that animals are descended from at most only four or five progenitors, and plants from an equal or lesser number." (2) He actually thought it possible that all living things descended from one primordial form, but was not quite ready to commit himself to an idea that shocking and controversial. (3)

From an awareness of the similarities shared by many groups of organisms and the difficulty systematists have in deciding whether two groups are varieties of distinct species, Darwin developed his ideas about the close relationship between all living things. For example, Darwin cites the classic case of the swim bladder possessed by some fish that is remarkably similar to the lungs of terrestrial animals. (4) Also, the similarities found in the embryos of many animals influenced Darwin. He attached great significance to examples of ontogeny recapitulating phylogeny, like the presence of gill slits in the embryonic form of animals whose adult form does not have gills. (5) He said,

We see in these facts some deep organic bond, throughout space and time, over the same areas of land and water, independently of physical conditions. The naturalist must be dull who is not led to enquire what this bond is.

The bond is simply inheritance, that cause which alone, as far as we positively know, produced organisms quite like each other, or as we see in the case of varieties, nearly alike. (6)

It is amazing that Darwin could say this when one realizes that he was unaware of even the basic Mendelian laws of inheritance. His ideas were ahead of his time. Further developments in genetics have filled in some of the gaps in his theory.

CALLIOPE Theory of Evolution

Darwin defined natural selection as a slow, gradual process that acts by preserving and accumulating small, favorable, inherited modifications.(7) He believed that there is no limit to the amount of change capable of being produced by natural selection (8), but did think there were some factors that had a major effect on whether or not the variations would be selected. These factors are:

1. The variation must be favorable.
2. There must be freedom for intercrossing.
3. The physical conditions should be slowly changing.
4. There should be some immigration of new colonies.
5. The nature of the competitors will have a profound influence on which modifications are selected.(9)

Some people took issue with Darwin's theory because they said that if all species were produced by gradual modification from another species, intermediate forms would be present today and/or in the fossil record. Darwin countered this objection in several ways. First, the fossil record is incomplete. Changing conditions throughout geological history sometimes prevents the production and preservation of fossils (10). Also, especially in Darwin's time, major excavation had been done only in Europe and America (11). Since Darwin believed that forms often originate in one place and then migrate to others, the fossils of intermediate forms could be in a place that has not yet been fully explored (12).

Another reason for the lack of intermediate forms both in the fossil record and alive today is that the forms are usually few in number and very much like other contemporary forms and therefore have a slim chance of surviving or being preserved. Competition is most severe between forms that are most alike, so the descendants tend to extinct their ancestral types (13). Darwin gave one last reason for the lack of intermediate forms. He stated that people have tended to look for links between an existing form and an ancestral form (14).

Although Darwin's theory is still accepted and used, parts of it have been discarded as new discoveries have been made. For example, Darwin used Lamarck's ideas about use and disuse and the inheritance of acquired characteristics to help support his

CALLIOPE

Theory of Evolution

theory. He believed that instincts developed as a result of the increased use of certain behavior patterns over a long period of time (15). Now, however, these ideas have been discredited, but Darwin's theory still holds together because modern discoveries in the field of genetics are able to explain these phenomena in more sophisticated ways.

Today, some scientists question whether Darwin's ideas about gradual changes over a long time are entirely accurate. A new theory, punctuated equilibrium, is gaining popularity. This theory proposes that a species might exist for many years in exactly the same state and then suddenly experience a dramatic change. Advocates of this theory believe it presents a better explanation of the sudden appearance of new forms in the fossil record.

A contemporary of Darwin, Mr. Mivart, proposed an alternative to gradualism that sounds very much like punctuated equilibrium. Darwin explained Mr. Mivart's theory:

Mr. Mivart is further inclined to believe, and some naturalists agree with him, that new species manifest themselves with suddenness and by modifications appearing at once. This conclusion, which implies great breaks of discontinuity in the series, seems improbable to me in the highest degree.(16)

Darwin gives four major reasons for his skepticism of this theory:

1. Mutations would be lost over time with intercrossing.
2. The close relationship between the various taxa implies gradual evolution.
3. The sudden abrupt appearance of new forms in the fossil record can be attributed to the fragmentary nature of the record itself.
4. He sees a record of the slow development and evolution of forms in the concept of "Ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny"(17).

CALLIOPE Theory of Evolution

It has not yet been decided by the experts whether gradualism or punctuated equilibrium is the best explanation of the mechanism of evolution. Perhaps it is a combination of the two. And, although he was wrong about some things and did not have all the answers, Darwin is to be commended for a theory that was ahead of its time and for supporting it with a wealth of evidence.

Darwin's theory has been questioned by non-scientists as well. The religious community, especially, has devoted a great deal of time to disputing the theory of evolution. It is somewhat ironic that Darwin's theory has raised so much furor, because several of the ideas he incorporated in it had already been discussed. Michael Ruse, in his review of "Science On Trial: The Case For Evolution," says, "Although the coming of Darwin's great work undoubtedly caused consternation, its ideas were probably not really that novel or shocking"(18). For example, Sir Charles Lyell's THE PRINCIPLES OF GEOLOGY states that the earth has existed much longer than previously believed and has undergone many changes, some great, some small, for many, many years. And descent from common ancestors had been proposed at least as early as the late eighteenth century by scientists such as Erasmus, Darwin, Lamarck, and Buffon. Common ancestry was proposed by these men because they felt similarities within genera implied relationship. Darwin synthesized these ideas and developed new ones of his own. He "made evolution public and respectable."(19)

Since some of Darwin's ideas were only somewhat new and revolutionary, perhaps it is the implications of his theory that have caused most of the controversy. Some people feel that the theory of evolution detracts from the omnipotence of God. Darwin did not intend this to be a result of his work. He says in the concluding chapter of ON THE ORIGIN OF THE SPECIES, "I see no good reason why the views on this volume should shock the religious feelings of anyone."(20) Darwin agrees with Kingsly that "It is just as noble a conception of the Deity to believe that he created a few original forms capable of development into other and needful forms."(21)

Creationists, then and now, object to Darwin's destruction of the idea of the special creation by God of each unchanging species. Until Darwin, most people believed that each species was the result of special creation and was a permanent type that has maintained a constant character (22). The Creationists base their ideas on a literal interpretation of Genesis, even though this literalism denies the facts presented to us each day by science and nature:

CALLIOPE Theory of Evolution

on the view of each organism with all its separate parts having been specially created, how utterly inexplicable is it that organs bearing the plain stamp of inutility, such as the teeth in the embryonic calf or the shrivelled wings under the soldered wing covers of many beetles, should so frequently occur. Nature may be said to have taken pains to reveal her scheme of modification by means of rudimentary organs, of embryological and homologous structures, but we are too blind to understand her meaning.(23)

Another criticism of evolution by Creationists is the differences of opinion among scientists. They imply that if the theory of evolution were valid, all scientist would agree completely on all the details. This as a dangerous argument, for one could also say that all Biblical scholars must agree on one interpretation of the Bible for Christianity to be considered valid. As Ruse says in decidedly Darwinistic terminology, "Good science involves sharp dispute. As in nature, a brisk struggle for existence leads to change"(24). For, as the Romantic poet William Blake said in THE MARRIAGE OF HEAVEN AND HELL, "Without contraries, there is no progression."

Some Creationists refuse to admit the facts that support evolution. Henry Morris, director of the Institute For Creation Research, denies Lyell's ideas about the age of the earth, radiocarbon dating, and evolution: "If the Bible is really the word of God...then evolution and its geological age system must be completely false."(26) Others go so far as to deny that we see natural selection working in our world today: "It is going on all around us, and even within us. One of the most serious drawbacks of using antibiotics too freely is that bacteria EVOLVE resistance to them within our own bodies."(27)

One wonders how Creationism continues to have proponents when it uses the same arguments that Darwin refuted 120 years ago and denies the existence of proven facts like natural selection in bacteria. Paul Thompson attributes the continued popularity of Creationism to the ease of understanding its ideas and concepts. Science on the other hand, is "very difficult to understand and interpret. 'Creation science' is not."(28)

Although Darwin has been portrayed as the big, bad wolf by religious people, he was also a deeply religious man. He held a degree in theology and "seriously attempted to harmonize science and religion."(29) William E. Phipps, author of "Darwin, the Scientific Creationist," believes Darwin to be a synthesis

CALLIOPE Theory of Evolution

between the extremes of anti-theological scientism and anti-scientific creationism.(30) He says that Darwin believed God ordained that creation operate without interference through the natural laws he had established.(31) One of Darwin's contemporaries, William Whewell, also believed this: "Events are brought about not by insulated interpositions of Divine power, exerted in each particular case, but by the establishment of general laws."(32)

Darwin never denies the existence of God or the need for God. In fact, Darwin seems to regard God as a first cause. Phipps says that Darwin teaches us to "interpret the elimination of God's immediate control over events as heightening God's glory, rather than reducing God's power."(33) Phipps states:

Darwin, however, deserves to be called a scientific creationist because he attempted to knit together scientific and theological theories in a way that affords a more unified and comprehensive view of reality.(34)

Darwin got the who of evolution from theology and the how from science.

The fact that Darwin's theory is still being discussed and used, that it has indeed endured unlike contemporary theories concerning spontaneous generation and the inheritance of acquired characteristics, that it has survived attacks from the scientific and religious sectors demonstrates its strength. It is amazing that Darwin was able to develop such an advanced theory without the benefit of knowing the laws of inheritance and other current facts. He deserves to be commended and respected, even though he was not correct in all that he hypothesized.

Peter the Great:
A Psychological and Symbolical Microcosm of Russia
by
Cynthia Spraker

Peter the Great, historians tell us, modernized Russia. He brought the church under state authority, westernized dress and architecture, organized an enormous bureaucracy, and instigated educational and economic reforms. All this is certainly true, but other evidence points to a different conclusion.

This essay proposes the alternative thesis that Peter was not a pure representative of the new state, but was a combination of old and new Russia, and this combination produced an internal battle within Peter's personality. Peter was a microcosm of Russia. There were numerous dualisms and conflicts that could be witnessed within his character that were representations of the current of history. In particular, it is necessary to examine this problem from a psychological and a religious point of view, because the changes that evolved especially in the perversion of religious symbols, were also manifestations of the psychological processes occurring both in Peter and in Russia.

The psychological characteristics of control and mania produced a dichotomous personality in Peter. Terrified of disorder, Peter tried to order everything. Yet this passion for order sparked explosions of mania. This mania itself, however, had a precisely structured order.

The first aspect of Peter's personality was his obsessive need for control. Specific traumas in Peter's childhood accounted for the origin of this element of his personality. In the 1670's, competition between the Miloslavski and Naryshkin families caused continuous strife in their fight for the throne. The Miloslavski side dominated during much of Peter's youth. He and his mother, of the Naryshkin branch, were exiled to the country where Peter mixed with many classes of people. Soon after, Peter was forced to watch many of his relatives be killed by the streltsy due to a rumor begun by the Miloslavskis. In 1682, Peter was proclaimed co-tsar with Ivan, a weakling as a person and as a ruler.

CALLIOPE Peter the Great

Peter was isolated a second time in the country while his aunt, Princess Sophia, took power. During this time, he spent many hours playing army with real guns in what was essentially a miniature version of a military unit (Lawrence, 1978, pp. 141-143). At this point in Peter's life, the lack of control represented by the Civil War and its personal consequences for Peter affected his ways of dealing with life. He played, but playing was a serious thing. Structure restricted fun that could erupt into violence and mania.

In 1696, Ivan died and Peter became the new tsar; the Naryshkins confined Sophia to a convent. Meanwhile, they began to pressure Peter to marry and produce an heir. This was to be Peter's first step in stabilizing and organizing his environment. Russian scholars claim Peter sought to westernize Russia in order to keep up with the modernization occurring in Europe. Certainly, practical variables like economic need and political policies played a part in this, but consciously and subconsciously, Peter used these as cover-ups for a personal need for security.

Western modernization and organization definitely complemented Peter's psychological needs. The city of St. Petersburg was well-planned, providing daily order in appearance and instilling a sense of stability needed in Peter's life. The placement of the Church under the auspices of the state was an effort to control that which was threatening to supreme power. The Church was no longer the giver of divine guidance but was only another branch of a huge bureaucracy. Police surveillance increased, and tighter restrictions even regulated private gatherings (Bogoslovskii cited in Raeff, 1972, p.56). Symbolically, the factor of control was best evidenced in Peter's selection of the title, Imperator or Emperor, which banished the images of Father Tsar and the accompanying traditions. The network of control was very intricate, with one of the biggest controlling factors coming from the very flesh and blood of Peter. One of Peter's earliest experiences with the need for control was the imperative nature of producing an heir. However, Alexis was not exactly the kind of son Peter had in mind. Instead of a strong reforming son who would continue Peter's policies, Alexis embodied the tradition and ideals of old Russia (Lawrence, 1978, pp. 162-165). The problem was the threat that this posed to Peter. Obviously, Alexis did not have Peter's passion for control. With support from the remnants of the Old Believers, Alexis threatened to plunge Russia backwards. Alexis represented a total lack of the system and order that Peter had created as the autocrat. Power was concentrated in Peter, and indeed, Peter was a synonym for power. The conflict between Peter and Alexis was not only one of father and son, but one of

CALLIOPE
Peter the Great

old and new as well as control and mania.

In his weakness and adherence to the traditional ways of Russia, Alexis was the direct antithesis to Peter. Although Alexis represented an ordered way of life, according to Peter it was the wrong order. Peter allowed his own fears about loss of control to allow himself to believe that his son had contrived a plot against him. After a voluntary exile, Alexis returned with what he thought was an unconditional pardon, only to become the victim of his father's rage and suspicion. In the end, Peter was able to forgive Alexis as a father but not as the "Father of Russia" (Besancon, cited in Raeff, 1972, p.170).

In Peter's role as Father of Russia, important symbolic changes occurred. Peter was referred to as Father not of "Holy Russia," or "Mother Russia," but of the "Fatherland." (Prokopovich cited in Raeff, 1972, p. 39). The specific religious emphasis vanished in the elimination of the word "holy," and Peter lost the nurturing image of the "Mother" to the dominant "Father" figure. In this new imagery, Peter's son was Russia, and Peter was the all-powerful molder of its future. However, Peter's legacy was destined to fall into the incompetent hands of his son, Alexis. As Creator of an altered westernized state, Peter had to destroy persons, symbols, traditions, ideals, and beliefs reminiscent of the old state. In creating his own security, Peter brought everything in the nation under his sovereign control and centralized it to the state. Although Peter referred to service to the state, in reality, Peter was actually referring to service to himself. Essentially, the state and Peter were one. The results of the new empire, however, destroyed what was the backbone of Russian culture, tradition, and symbols.

Peter was both a Christ and an Anti-Christ figure as he saved Russia from what he saw as stagnation, but altered its values and traditions by force. As Russia's redeemer, Peter guided it to salvation through westernization without allowing his people freedom to choose to adopt these changes. There existed unity between the state and the egocentricity of the Tsar. He required an oath of service as if he were a god and not a leader of a country. Similarly, Peter united the legislative, judicial, and executive portions of government in his person, with the Church as a subordinate department of the bureaucracy. This was reminiscent of the omniscient, omnipresent, and omnipotent powers of God. Kliuchevsky's assumption (cited in Raeff, 1972, p. 38) that Peter had a concern for his people and a sense of responsibility to them is questionable. In outward appearances, this may have been true. However, Peter's concern for the development of Russia and its people was greatest when

CALLIOPE

Peter the Great

Russia and Peter agreed that what was best for Russia was also best for Peter. In Prokopovich's eulogy of Peter (cited in Raeff, 1972, p. 41), he referred to Peter as a Moses figure. However, the law was no longer based on a divine revelation or a clerical interpretation but upon the will of Peter. One Tsar, one State, one country, Amen!

Although Peter's reforms appeared to be ordered and structured, underneath lurked a malignant threat of uncontrollable mania, especially reflected in the personal habits of the Tsar. Perhaps the manic activities were a release from an intense attempt to control, or perhaps they were the reality of the problem that needed to be controlled. Again, the origin of this unpredictable behavior can be traced to Peter's childhood memories of the slaughter of his relatives and the night of his pursuit by the army of Princess Sophia. In the latter incident, Peter escaped to the Holy Trinity Monastery, but developed a facial twitch thereafter (Lawrence, 1978, pp. 144-145). Psychologically, a twitch or tic is usually a physical manifestation of mental anxiety that has no organic cause (Coleman, Butcher, and Carson, 1980, p. 512).

The uncertainty of the childhood years might have also led to a condition of generalized anxiety disorder. This is

a relatively constant state of tension, worry, and diffuse uneasiness. [Persons with this disorder] are oversensitive in interpersonal relationships, and frequently have difficulty concentrating and making decisions, dreading to make a mistake. The high level of tension they experience is often reflected in strained postural movements. Commonly, they complain of muscular tension,...and sleep disturbances that include insomnia and nightmares. They perspire profusely and their palms are often clammy; they may show cardiovascular changes such as elevated blood pressure and increased pulse rate. They may experience breathlessness and heart palpitations for no apparent reasons. (Coleman, Butcher, and Carson, 1980, p. 207)

Peter was plagued by "nightmares, a fear of sleeping alone, compulsive drinking and a hysterical fear of black beetles" (Lawrence, 1978, p. 145). He was an extremely restless individual who "travelled extensively...walked too fast... could not sit still,...and had a fear of high ceilings" (Kliuchevsky, cited in Raeff, 1972, pp. 24 and 26). Peter's reaction to official ceremonies included heavy breathing, perspiring, and turning red in the face. His anxiety manifested itself in the

CALLIOPE
Peter the Great

cruel torture of the streltsy, after which Peter's compulsion for parties increased. Peter was obsessed with a need to embarrass others, often commanding them to perform repulsive acts. What percentage of this behavior can be attributed to genetics is unknown, but "nervous activity and mental agility were characteristic of the Naryshkin family" (Kliuchevsky cited in Raeff, 1972, p. 22). Where control existed, an equal amount of mania counterbalanced it. A fear of mania seemed to terrify Peter. Even when Peter overindulged, some type of structure regimented his licentious gatherings. "The Most Drunken Synod of Fools and Jesters" illustrates the united dichotomy of control and mania.

The structure and activities of this group were a horrendous parody of the hierarchy of the church. However, it illustrated the religious symbolism that still existed in a perverted form. Peter provided an avenue for maniacal release, but only in the form of a command, as in the order to stay drunk. These prescriptions were regulated within a structure. There were twelve cardinals, bishops, archimandrites, a Psalter and a Liturgy, an All-Jesting Mother Superior and her abbesses, as well as as a Creed that asked, "Do you drink?" (Kliuchevsky cited in Raeff, 1972, pp.32-33). The similarity to religious symbolism was striking, especially when those who were caught sober were "excommunicated." Further parodies included sacrilegious processions and conversion of traditional symbols of religion to perverted ones. Here again, we see Peter's mania was ordered due to his fear of a loss of control. It should also be noted that Peter was constantly forcing others to exceed their limits while he watched. As Tsar, he had ultimate control. Although Peter participated in these festivities to a shocking excess, part of his pleasure was achieved vicariously. While remaining in control of his faculties, Peter forced his guests to engage in mass drinking and orgies. However, devouring of food and alcohol was quite extensive on his own part and may have been an attempt to eliminate symbolically the opposition that Peter faced within himself and within his country. In psychological terms, he may have displaced his anxiety and problems to an unrelated area of behavior.

Peter also demonstrated a maniacal order in his daily life, which included early mornings of manual labor, days of running an increasingly complex empire, and full evenings of decadence (Lawrence, 1972, p. 158). Peter commanded respect for himself by his constant activity. The latter represents an extreme amount of personal discipline - or was it a fear of mania? Was Peter an overachiever or was he afraid of something? The latter is more plausible in the psychological assessment of Peter's character and his historical background. Peter's creation of a

CALLIOPE
Peter the Great

vast bureaucracy demonstrated his fear of disorder. Persons ignoring Peter's wishes risked personal reprimand or worse.

The two diverse qualities of control and mania were unified in Peter's "self." However, Peter's self combined several dualities and symbolized the psychological complexity of Peter and of Russia. Peter was egocentric in his personal qualities and his actions, as was Russia. Russia took from the West that which served its ends. From a psychological point of view, when Peter spoke of the state or God, he was talking about himself. Russia's goals were the goals of Peter. His sense of duty to the state was due to his synonymity with the state. Therefore, service was in reality to Peter.

Peter was also a representative of the Creator, who controls but also destroys. As Creator and controller, Peter founded a new Russia. Scholars claimed he eliminated religious terminology and symbolism. For example, "Holy Russia" became the "Fatherland." Who was the Father? Peter. Who was the son? Russia. The Father/Son and God/Man parallel still existed. Also, with the death of old Russia, came the birth, or in actuality the beginning of the rebirth, of the nation. Symbolically, this was represented by the death of Alexis. In order for Russia to be reborn via Peter, Alexis, who represented the old ways and was a threat to the emerging country, had to die. Religion, which had been a controller of the country in the past, had to become a part of the state. Hence, Peter was both Tsar and God, man and God, secular and divine. The Christ analogy was clear. Peter brought the hope of a new world through westernization. In his eulogy of Peter, Prokopovich (cited in Raeff, 1972, p. 42), states,

He has gone - but he has not left us poor and wretched; his enormous powers and glory manifested in the deeds I spoke of before have remained with us. As he has shaped his Russia, so she will remain; he has made her lovable to good men, and she will be loved; he has made her fearful to her enemies, and she will be feared; he has glorified her throughout the world, and her glory will not end. He has left us spiritual, civil, and military reforms. For if his perishable body has left us, his spirit remains.

However, contrary to this eulogy, the remnants of the Old Believers bitterly referred to Peter as the Anti-Christ who made changes in the one secure structure of their lives, the Church. Westernization was a threat to a country that had been isolated from the rest of Europe. Free will was only available to the Tsar, whose will was irrefutable.

CALLIOPE
Peter the Great

The symbolism indicating the changes in Russia is usually represented as a dichotomy between the symbolism of "before Peter" and "after Peter." The former is viewed as religious while the latter is usually termed secular. Actually, Peter was the combination of both, which resulted in the perversion of many of the religious symbols. The dichotomy between religious symbols and their perversion represented the dualistic and dichotomous nature of Peter's personality. The dualisms of Christ/Anti-Christ; Creator/Destroyer; Egocentrism/State; Control/Mania; Death/Rebirth; Holy Russia/Fatherland; Church/State; Religion/Secularism were evident in Peter as well as in the country itself. Symbolically, Peter was a mini-copy of Russia. Russia's need for structure to control the fear of mania as she caught up with the modernized West permeated every aspect of the country's culture.

As well as being the impetus for change, Peter was ironically responsible for the historical continuity of Russia. The conditions already existed for potential change, but Peter with his peculiar personality was the force necessary to continue those changes. In many ways, Peter was a product of his time as well as a force in the changing of those times. Peter and the changes in Europe threatened the security of historical tradition and instilled a sense of continual anxiety within Russia. Peter attempted to control disorder with structures such as the bureaucracy, but also inflicted disorder on others via "The Most Drunken Synod of Fools and Jesters."

Order permeated Peter's changes, which allowed him and Russia to have some sense of security. However, this was a false security due to the unpredictable quality of the combination of control and mania. Russia and Peter were "straddling the fence" between old and new, and both exhibited a psychologically explosive combination of mania and control. Peter may have instigated the majority of the new reforms, but he was also a product of his society, its symbolism, and its psychological make-up. Peter and Russia were intertwined in a microcosmic/macrocosmic relationship of psychological turmoil rooted in a history that simultaneously created and destroyed.

The Child's World of Play

by

Michele L. Sluder

Few things are as fascinating as watching a young child absorbed in a conversation with an imaginative friend or playing fireman with a little red engine. Adults think of many of the playful activities of children as cute. A scene that would probably elicit such thoughts would be that of a young girl cuddling a doll and talking to it soothingly to cease its crying. The importance that society places on such play can be seen in the variety of toys and the tremendous amount of time, money, and effort directed toward the production of toys. However, it appears that children's play as we know it today has not always existed or been recognized so readily. During the Renaissance, there was no evidence of the concept of child or child-like behavior (Butler, Gotts, and Quisenberry, 1978). In essence, no one experienced childhood. Rather, all children were looked upon as miniature adults. That is not to say that activities such as festivals and games did not exist. However, such activities participated in by children were for the purpose of learning the various roles of society.

These ideas underwent a change during the 17th and 18th centuries as European societies experienced an increase in play among children. England, however, was an exception. Play was prohibited in the streets by law and, consequently, suppressed in the family. A slow development of play behavior was evident in America as well. What little play existed varied with geography and with ethnic origin. However, even this little bit of play was seen as work related. Such a view of play was a result of the emphasis placed on the value of work and the avoidance of play by religion, particularly by the Protestant work ethic.

No significant event occurred to increase society's awareness of play behavior. Recognition was merely a gradual process. Of significance is the fact that alongside this recognition of play behavior there also appeared a variety of psychological theories that attempted to both define and explain those activities referred to as playful and that seemed to be found predominately in the lives of children.

CALLIOPE - The Child's World of Play

Developmental Theories

Speculations concerning the reasons children play are as abundant as attempts at defining play. Numerous theorists suggest three basic reasons why children play (Butler, Gotts, and Quisenberry, 1978). First, children play in an effort to understand and master their environment. There is evidence to support the idea that children without opportunities to play do not learn the cognitive, physical, and social skills needed as an adult as well as children who do play. That is, children seem to need the freedom to manipulate and explore their environment. It also appears as though children have some natural tendency to play. Almost any child placed in a room of toys will go to examine the toys as a result of curiosity. Second, children use play as a means to display their feelings. A child can learn to handle emotions such as hostility, happiness, and embarrassment, in "safe," socially acceptable ways in play. Third, children play in order to express themselves creatively. This is evident in their attempts to build structures out of tinker toys or blocks, to imagine themselves as famous singers or dancers and to be masters of art with their many colored crayons and paints (sometimes, however, in the wrong places!).

Not every theory deals with or even acknowledges all three of the possible motivations behind children's play. Rather, each one has chosen a different aspect to emphasize. However, one should keep in mind a suggestion by Levy (1978) not to view characteristics of play behavior as mutually exclusive. Several characteristics may explain the motivation behind the behavior. Too, there may be a combination of reasons for selection of an activity. For example, a child modeling something out of clay could be doing so because he wants to express himself creatively, to display his feelings of anger symbolically, and to master an element of his environment. The activity, therefore, could be the result of all three motivations.

The more prominent theories recognized today are the approaches taken by psychoanalytic, social-learning, and cognitive-developmental theorists. It is interesting to note the different direction each approach has taken and the placement of emphasis in regard to motivation each has chosen.

Psychoanalytic Theory

Play, according to Freud, provides individuals with the opportunity to fulfill two major needs of humans, which are innate (Levy, 1978). The first is a need to be grown up, which consists of two components. The biological aspects of this need are internal biological maturational processes that push the

CALLIOPE

The Child's World of Play

child to grow up. The social and psychological aspects of the need are a result of the child's observations of his parents, which result in the development of the child's wishes to grow up. These wishes pull the child toward maturity.

Operating in the satisfaction of this need to be grown up is the pleasure principle. The child seeks immediate gratification of his wishes to be grown up and he desires a pleasant experience when doing so. Basically, the child achieves satisfaction in play by choosing objects from reality and structuring his own world with those objects in a way that avoids pain and creates a pleasant experience. A young girl who takes her playroom and pretends it is a real house is arranging her environment with present objects to suit her desires. When she exerts authority over her dolls-like her mother- she is demonstrating her wish to grow up.

The second need that motivates children to play is the need to assume an active role in society (Levy, 1978; Singer, 1973). The psychoanalytic model of man sees this as the primary goal in life. This need operates on the repetition-compulsion principle (Lehman and Witty, 1976). Play allows fulfillment of this need by the alleviation of anxiety that was aroused by a conflict in a real life situation. Children will re-enact in play, over and over, a very stressful event that they experienced either personally or vicariously. This is the child's way of working through a difficult experience and restoring his sense of mastery of his environment. It is this sense of mastery that allows him to feel he is participating in his environment in an active manner.

A relationship will often exist between the developmental stage that the child is presently in and the play behavior the child exhibits (Millar, 1969). The child's enjoyment of blowing bubbles is a reflection of the oral stage, while his fascination for sand and water at the beach implies that he is in the anal stage of development. Play behavior during the phallic stage usually consists of pretending to be father or mother. Freud also mentions how play can become an arena for the use of ego defense mechanisms, particularly of projection. For example, a child can have a bad experience when her mother threatens her over an activity that was intended for the satisfaction of a need. Repression of the wish occurs as a result. The reenactment of the event to alleviate anxiety can involve a transformation of the threat into its opposite. The child may become the mother and approve the same behavior for which she was threatened in her dolls.

CALLIOPE The Child's World of Play

Social-Learning Theory

Several social learning theories attempt to explain play (Levy, 1978). As usual, play is viewed as a learned association between a stimulus and a response. In particular, play is seen as a product of the socialization process, which is based on the learning of secondary drives. Secondary drives become effective through the previous reduction of some primary drive. The need to be accepted is an example of a learned secondary motive. If a child is playing with blocks, builds a house out of the blocks, and receives praise and recognition from his parents as reward, he will continue to play with blocks in that way because it resulted in a reduction of his social need for acceptance through secondary reinforcement. The experience has predisposed the individual to expect certain outcomes with certain events, as does the socialization process.

The other more specific social-learning theories structure their concepts of play around the socialization process, but their explanation of play is much more specific. In particular, the Compensation Theory of play suggests that people are motivated to play in order to compensate for a disability that delimits their behavior in other important areas of their life (Levy, 1978). There is the implication in this theory that play is merely an extension of the psychological defense mechanisms that are used for the purpose of maintaining and/or enhancing self-esteem and to escape and/or defend against anxiety. Mitchell and Mason (Levy, 1978) believe that what actually motivates a person to play is the arousal of frustration that occurs when goal-directed behavior is blocked. If it is a person's disability that is blocking the behavior, the person will overcome anxiety by seeking leisure activities to compensate.

In addition to the Compensation Theory are two more specific types. One of these is the Supplemental Compensatory Theory of play suggested by Kando and Summers (Levy, 1978). They believe that because man's survival is assured both on and off the job (a result of being in the post-industrial age of leisure) energy is focused toward true expression. People are more concerned with things like creativity, the uniqueness of their own selves, and self-actualization. Experiences such as these can not be experienced in the work situation and thus are pursued outside of work in leisure activities (i.e. play).

The Reactive Compensatory Theory of play is the other type of Compensation Theory (Levy, 1978). This theory suggests that humans are continuously striving to overcome survival dissatisfactions such as health hazards, tension, anxiety, and

CALLIOPE

The Child's World of Play

fatigue. If not controlled, these dissatisfactions will eventually lead to the destruction of man. Therefore, man "recharges his battery" in play to be able to face these dissatisfiers each day.

Another social-learning theory of play is referred to as the Generalization Theory (Levy, 1978). This theory says that learned play behavior responses to one set of stimuli will also be evoked by other stimuli that are closely associated with the original set of stimuli. This means that a child who learns to enjoy sliding down a slide will perform the act on any other objects that are similar. The child will react to novel play situations in accordance with previous play experiences.

The Conflict-Enculturation Theory states that play provides individuals with the opportunity to participate in the learning of social skills without fear of having to experience serious repercussions that would result if the same attempts at learning had met with failure in the real world. The idea is based on a strong relationship that was found to exist between child-rearing practices and games played in a society. In cross-cultural research, it was found that parents create conflict in their children through their method of child-rearing. Children, then, appease the stress aroused by playing games that are representative of the larger society, except on a smaller scale. Play is thus a way of preparing and teaching the child to deal with society's goals. Interestingly, it was revealed that the different child-rearing practices aroused different anxieties, and consequently each society would play a different type of game. In societies where the child-rearing practices aroused anxieties over obedience, play consisted of games of strategy. Games of chance dominated where child-rearing practices aroused anxieties over responsibility. And, in societies that emphasized achievement, games of physical skill were more frequent.

Cognitive Developmental Theory

Play is bound into the concept of the growth of intelligence, according to Piaget (Levy, 1978; Millar, 1969; Butler, Gotts, and Quisenberry, 1978). Furthermore, Piaget's theory adheres to the idea that higher levels of cognitive functioning are achieved through what he refers to as an assimilation-accommodation process. Ideally, play is pure assimilation, yet this is not possible because a certain amount of accommodation is always present. The purpose of assimilation is to make accommodation possible, given the individual's present cognitive level. Play, therefore, is the act of bending reality to fit one's existing level of cognitive functioning. New situations can only be accommodated through assimilation.

CALLIOPE

The Child's World of Play

However, as the child matures, there is less of a need to assimilate. With age, the child's repertoire of objects and situations expands so that he encounters less frequently novel situations that need to be incorporated into his cognitive structures. Eventually, the child will achieve the optimal level of adaptation that is a balance between assimilation and accommodation.

Piaget says that play begins in the sensory motor stage. At this time, play is limited to the seeking, grasping, pushing, reaching, and pulling of objects. Piaget mentions that in order for an action to be considered play, however, it must be repetitious in nature. He also notes that at the onset of the stage exploratory behavior of objects and the environment will be random. Near the end of the stage, though, exploratory play behavior will be more systematic because the child is able to distinguish particular actions and particular objects. Play during this stage is referred to as practice play. Symbolic play replaces play when thought appears.

During the preoperational stage, a child is concerned with the internalization and representation in thought of what was learned in the previous stage. Symbolic play accomplishes this goal. All thinking is organized in terms of images and symbols. As in practice play, symbolic play is repetitious in nature. With the onset of language, a child will continually ask questions over and over, apparently just for the sake of asking. Actually, though, the child is in the process of assimilating and accommodating all of his previously learned knowledge into symbols. In addition, symbolic play functions to assimilate and accommodate emotional experiences. However, emotional experiences that are represented in play are distorted because there is no effort to adapt to reality (a higher level of cognitive functioning is needed). In sum, all play behaviors during this stage are said by Piaget to be of one of the following types: a) gross and fine motor (e.g., tricycle riding), b) creative play (e.g., clay, tinkler toys), c) imitative play (e.g., dress-up), d) social play (e.g., sand box), or e) cognitive play (e.g., numbers and letter games).

A wish by the child for a system of thought and non-contradiction characterizes behavior during the concrete operational stage. Play behavior that satisfies this desire consists of games and play that are based on rules, that manipulate things such as numbers and weights, and that deal with temporal and spatial order. Group play predominates. Examples of group play that are important during this stage include organized sports, clubs, and parties. There are fewer instances of make-believe in this stage as the child is becoming more

CALLIOPE

The Child's World of Play

integrated into the real world, mainly as a result of the apparent increase in social contact.

By the time the child reaches the stage of formal operations, play has been limited to include only games, stories, puzzles that involve complex problem-solving and the the arts. This is a result of the child being concerned with the development of abstract thinking, formal thought, and the ability to form logical assumptions. Very little assimilation is utilized during this stage, especially compared to the earlier stages. The child at this point is very near a balance of the processes of assimilation and accommodation. Piaget does allude to the idea that the play-related activities of adults are merely a continuation of this interest in games with rules, which is apparent in the last two stages of development.

There are two consequences of play behavior discussed by Piaget (Levy, 1978). One result is simply that of pleasure and joy. This is apparent in a child who will sit for hours playing with a set of blocks and show deep satisfaction. Piaget refers to this as "functional pleasure." A second consequence of play is the acquisition of adaptive roles. In play, the child has the opportunity to test out novel social, physical, cognitive, and emotional patterns that can not yet be accommodated because of the child's level of cognitive development. The experiences of being wrong, sad, confused, and aggressive are then placed in the child's memory bank to be retrieved at a later time.

General Developmental Trends

Information concerning developmental trends in play behavior is very limited. This is mainly because the idea of play as an area of study is a fairly recent occurrence. Therefore, in regard to developmental trends, the present discussion will only include research findings dealing with general age growth patterns, sex differences, and racial differences.

General Age Growth Patterns

A majority of the theories, such as Piaget's, suggest distinct changes of play behavior and interests with certain ages. There is the implication that the development of play is periodic in nature. Such an implication, suggest Lehman and Witty (1976), places undue emphasis on an aspect of play that in reality does not exist. The research of Lehman and Witty (1976) has yielded results that support the idea that play is more continuous than has previously been suggested. Their studies have revealed that play interests are relatively permanent from age to age. It also appears that changes in play behavior are

CALLIOPE

The Child's World of Play

very gradual and contingent, not sudden and sporadic.

In addition, Lehman and Witty (1976) uncovered two other points of interest in regard to general age growth trends. One, in relation to the number of activities participated in by different age groups, younger children did partake in greater number than the older children. Older children, it seems, are more conservative in those fewer number of activities in which they do participate. These children appeared to be motivated by an "economy of effort." No random activity was displayed by the older group, and they showed less of a response to slight stimuli. This was compared to the fact that even slight stimuli will activate vigorous activity in younger children. Basically, older children require a definite goal for an activity in order to justify the use of energy in participation, while younger children will utilize energy in play for the mere sake of the activity itself. The second finding by Lehman and Witty (1976) is that play behavior appears to reach a peak between the ages of 8 1/2 and 10 1/2. This may be the turning point where the child's behavior becomes more conservative in nature as opposed to random.

Sex Differences

The popular belief that there are conspicuous differences in the play behavior of males and females seems to be in error. Play behavior has been found by Lehman and Witty (1976) to be very difficult to classify in regard to those activities preferred by the different sexes. It was found that activity that was engaged in frequently by males at a young age was often found to be preferred by females at an older age. The activity could not be classified as preferred by either sex unless age was acknowledged. However, it has been found that at very early ages, between 5 1/2 and 8 1/2, boys seem to prefer active play while girls prefer activities more sedentary in nature (Lehman and Witty, 1976; Millar, 1969). At this age, the only activities that were found to be exclusive to each sex were football and playing dolls.

Between the ages of 8 1/2 and 12 1/2, children begin to show a noticeable difference in the way they play. Boys are much more vigorous in their play, and they exert more energy. Overall, the play behavior of boys includes activities that require muscular dexterity, skill, and strength. Their preferred play usually contains an element of competition and is based on a higher degree of organization. Girls, on the other hand, utilize language. One last difference is that of geographic range. Boys prefer to play away from home with their choice of activities reflecting this, while girls prefer to play near the home.

CALLIOPE

The Child's World of Play

Again, their choice of activities will also reflect this desire.

Racial Differences

The problem with studying racial differences is that an adequate technique for measuring racial difference has not been developed. This is probably due to the fact that it is assumed by many that such differences are very conspicuous. Lehman and Witty (1976), however, feel that they have developed an adequate technique to detect any racial differences in play behavior. Using this new technique, they found that blacks were more social in their play. This fact was very pronounced and consistent. They expounded further on this idea to say that this over-indulgence in play is what results in inferiority scholastically. This is not to say that blacks are inferior scholastically, but that for those that are, an excess of social play can hinder them in developing individual skills that are necessary for academic achievement. The reference is made to skills such as reading and writing. Lehman and Witty (1976) also found it ironic that blacks play school more frequently than white children do. They suggest that play as such may be compensatory in nature. Play school may symbolize the knowledge, power, and prestige that many black children feel they can never achieve in reality.

Recent Research

Play is a relatively new area of research. It is important that the research has not been approached only with the intention of uncovering variables that are related to play. Rather, many researchers are trying to utilize their findings in a way that could possibly promote child development. As of yet, unfortunately, many of the ideas forthcoming can only be regarded as speculations. Additional research is very much needed. The interested reader may consult Rubin (1979) for a discussion of Vanderberg's research on play, problem-solving, and creativity, the work of Ross and Kay on the origin of social games, and the experiments by Sachs on the role of adult and child play in language development. While the results of such studies are not conclusive, they are rich in ideas and suggestions for future projects.

There is still much to be uncovered and explained with regard to the play of children. As more research is done, the sense of confusion over play will disappear. And it must be admitted that play is one of the few areas of study in which a researcher can have "real fun" while working intensively.

CONTRIBUTORS

Brenda Allen, English
Class of '85

Kathryn Lyons, English/Business
Class of '86

Michele Sluder, Psychology
Class of '84

Cynthia Spraker, History/Psychology
Class of '84

Irene Zurek, Business
Class of '85

